



**“THE BOARD GAME TO DEVELOP STUENTS’ SPEAKING SKILL FOR HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVERS”**

**The Case at The Eleventh Graders of Ihsaniyah Senior High School of Tegal In The Academic Year of 2013-2014**

**Maila Huda Shofyana**

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

**Info Artikel**

*Sejarah Artikel:*  
Diterima Oktober 2014  
Disetujui Oktober 2014  
Dipublikasikan  
Juni 2014

*Keywords:*  
*Board Game,*  
*Achievement,*  
*Speaking*

**Abstract**

This study was investigated the effectiveness of the board game for High and Low Students’ achievement in speaking. The objects of this study were conducted at the eleventh graders; the samples of the research were from two classes, each class consisting of 26 students for experimental group and 26 students for control group. Each class was divided into two groups based on their level of achievement (high and low). This research applied a quantitative method with a factorial design. The data were analyzed by using ANOVA and Tuckey test. The result of the study showed that: (1) there is no significant difference between using board game and drilling to the high achievers ;(2) There is a significant difference between using board game and drilling to the low achievers;(3) There is a significant difference of using board game to the high and low achievers; (4) There is a significant difference of using drilling to the high and low achievers; (5) There is a significant interaction of teaching technique (board game and drilling) and types of students of achievement (high and low).

© 2014 Universitas Negeri Semarang

Alamat korespondensi:  
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233  
E-mail: [pps@unnes.ac.id](mailto:pps@unnes.ac.id)

## INTRODUCTION

According to Harmer (2009: 76) language function is the purpose to achieve when you say or write something. Language is used to communicate, to express ourselves, to get our ideas across, and to connect with the person to whom we are speaking. When a relationship is working, the act of communicating seems to flow relatively effortlessly. Meanwhile Richard and Rodgers (2001: 108) state that language is purposeful.

In teaching English, actually there are four skills they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The statement clearly shows that the purpose of teaching English is to enable the students to master the four skills. Students who are taught with a good technique, strategy and method are more highly motivated than those who are not. It means that teacher should teach the students creatively so that students will be interested in teacher's way of teaching. These four skills are regarded as the serious problem for them. They commonly feel anxious and unconfident when they are assigned to do the task, especially when they are asked to speak English. Among these four skills, speaking is one of the skills that should be taught intensively.

Because of that speaking skill is very important to help the students to improve their speaking skill, know the message and understand what other people are saying to measure their skill. Furthermore, by speaking, the students can have a communication using English with their friends, their teacher, and other people. By speaking the students can also develop their idea and express it orally and they can enlarge their vocabulary mastery. But, in reality most of student in *Ihsaniyah* Senior High School of Tegal especially at the eleventh graders they are still afraid when the teacher asked them to speak, sometimes they were not understand what they have said because they just memorize the sentences.

According to Brown (2001: 257) speaking is literally defined as to say things, express thought aloud, and use the voice. Spoken language and speaking are similar in meaning that how people use the voice loudly that occurs in time cannot go back and change, and it is produced and processed.

The purpose of speaking is the students are able to communicate in their lives. To help the teachers in teaching speaking to senior high school students, teachers may use an interesting method to present their material that also helps them in creating fun class. One of alternative technique is board game which is suggested to be applied in teaching speaking. Board game is designed to provide second-language instruction in content and language. Board games are an important tool to provide hands-on and heads-on skill and knowledge development for people of all ages on all subjects. Not only do well-designed games create an engaging atmosphere, they also provide a non-threatening, playful, yet competitive environment in which to focus on content and reinforce and apply learning (Treher, 2011: 3).

Hornby (1995: 486) stated that game is an activity that you do to have some fun. Board game can be defined as something or an instrument that is used to attract students' motivation to follow the teaching and learning process because board game can make the students more focus in learning, because they do not feel that they are forced to learn. They also enable learners to acquire new experiences within a foreign language which are not always possible during a typical lesson. Board game can be method that will give many advantages for teacher and the students either. Another factor that also determines the success of teaching speaking is the students' achievement.

Related to the background above, the researcher formulated the research problem as follows:

Which one is more effective between board game and drilling to teach speaking for high achievers?

Which one is more effective between board game and drilling to teach speaking for low achievers?

How significant is the difference between high achievers' speaking and low achievers' speaking taught using board game?

How significant is the difference between high achievers' speaking and low achievers' speaking taught using drilling?

How significant is the interaction among teaching strategy (board game and drill) and students' achievement (high and low) to the student's speaking at the eleventh grade of *Ihsaniyah Senior High School* of Tegal?

## METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The research design used in this study is experimental. According to Johnson (1989:165) the most essential characteristic of an experiment is that the researcher manipulates the independent variable, that is the researcher designs and sets up the experimental and control treatments. Designing this experiment, I used factorial design. It has two or more independent variables acting on the dependent variable (Cohen, 2007:280). It allowed the researcher to identify the simultaneous as well as separate effects of independent variables (Tuckman, 1978: 136). So, the researcher could see how one of the variables might moderate the other.

The writer chooses the experimental research because the research is related to the effectiveness of teaching techniques used as the independent variables and achievement as the dependent variable in teaching speaking skill for the eleventh graders of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal. This research involves three kinds of variables namely independent variable, dependent variable, and attribute/ moderate variable. The independent variable of this research is the teaching techniques. The teaching techniques used in this study were the board game and drilling. In this way, the board game group of

students' functions as experimental group and drilling group of students function as control group. Furthermore, the dependent variable of this research was students' speaking skill of the eleventh graders of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal in the academic year of 2013/2014. The attribute variable of this research was students' achievement in learning.

A population is a set (or collection) of all elements possessing one or more attributes of interest (Arikunto, 2007: 130). Furthermore, Gay (1992: 125) states that population is the group of interest to the searcher, the group to which she or he would like the results of the study to be generalized. Based on the above definitions, population is the whole subjects that are going to be investigated. The population of this research is the eleventh graders students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school one of Tegal that consists of 118 students, it is divided into 4 classes, those are XI IPA 1, XI IPA 2, XI IPA 3, and the last is IPS.

Sample is a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they are selected (Gay, 1992: 125). Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2010: 81) adds that sample is a part of such characteristics in the population. Johnson and Christensen (2000:158) define sample as a set of elements taken from a larger population according to a certain rules. Furthermore, they state that a sample is always smaller than a population, and it is often much smaller. Based on the theories, Based on the theories above, I took 56 students or two classes from IPA 1 and IPA 2 as the samples of this study. In finding the subject of the study, I took the data from students' learning achievement report of odd semester to get high and low achievers before they were treated by board game for experimental group and drilling for the control group.

The experimental group that was chosen would be given a treatment by using the board game. On the other hand, the control group was taught by using drilling. In order to get the data of

students' speaking skill, the researcher gave them a speaking test. The test was used to know the students' speaking skill after being given treatment. The writer administered the steps as follows: (1) the writer gave the certain topic; (2) the students were given 20 minutes to prepare to make a dialogue; (3) the students performed the dialogue in pairs; (4) the students' dialogue was recorded and scored by two scorers, researcher and other person who understands how to score speaking. It is assumed that the score can be more objective.

In this research, I used statistical analysis using ANOVA with SPSS. ANOVA is concerned with differences between means of groups not variances. The name analysis of comes from the way the procedure uses variances to decide whether the means are different. Then, Tukey test was used to know the difference between teaching techniques and the mean score obtained was used to know which technique is more effective to teach speaking, whether the broad game or drilling.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Group Statistics

	Interaction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post test	Board Game-High achievers	8	3.6875	.17269	.06105
	Drilling-High achievers	8	3.5625	.09161	.03239
Gain	Board Game-High achievers	8	.7925	.11056	.03909
	Drilling-High achievers	8	.7346	.06105	.02158

Based on the table above, it can be seen that it can be seen that both of high achievers on board game and drilling statistically are the same effective. The average of board game 3.6875 and drilling is 3.5625, then the value in both of board game and drilling of high achievers also the same. Board game 0.7925 and drilling is 0.7346; it means that both of them are effective taught by those

technique in high achievers. Although statistically they are the same, but it can be seen that the average of students' speaking improvement on board game a little higher than drilling. Which is not only mean value of board game  $3.6875 > 3.5625$  of drilling, but also the gain value of board game  $0.7925 > 0.7346$ .

Table 2. Group Statistics

	Interaction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post test	Board Game-Low achievers	8	2.9375	.14079	.04978
	Drilling-Low achievers	8	2.6625	.23867	.08438
Gain	Board Game-Low achievers	8	.5328	.08763	.03098
	Drilling-Low achievers	8	.3938	.08638	.03054

Based on table 2 it can be seen that board game of low achievers have higher score than drilling of low achievers. The average of board game 2.9375 > 2.6625 of drilling, then the gain

value of board game 0.5328 > 0.3938 of drilling. It means that board game to low achievers is more effective than drilling.

**Table 3.** Gain Tukey HSD

Interaction	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Drilling-Low achievers	8	.3938		
Board Game-Low achievers	8		.5328	
Drilling-High achievers	8			.7346
Board Game-High achievers	8			.7925
Sig.		1.000	1.000	.563

The data shown on table 3 found that there is significant difference both of using the board game and drilling for low achievers and high achievers. From data analysis, it was found that there is significant interaction of teaching technique (board game and drilling) and result of students of achievement (high and low). It was

shown F-value is 9.965 > F-table 2.14 with the significance level of 0.000 < 0.05.

Hypothesis 1: there is no significant effectiveness between using board game and drill to the high achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal.

**Table 4.** Group Statistics

	Interaction	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post test	Board Game-High achievers	8	3.6875	.17269	.06105
	Drilling-High achievers	8	3.5625	.09161	.03239
Gain	Board Game-High achievers	8	.7925	.11056	.03909
	Drilling-High achievers	8	.7346	.06105	.02158

Based on table 4, it can be seen that both of high achievers on board game and drilling statistically are the same effective. The average of board game 3.6875 and drilling is 3.5625, then the gain value in both of board game and drilling of high achievers also the same. Board game 0.7925 and drilling is 0.7346; it means that both of them are effective taught by those technique in high achievers. Although statistically they are the same, but it can be seen that the average of students'

speaking improvement on board game a little higher than drilling. Which is not only mean value of board game 3.6875 > 3.5625 of drilling, but also the gain value of board game 0.7925 > 0.7346.

Hypothesis 2: there is no significant effectiveness between using board game and drill to the low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal.

**Table 5.** Group Statistics of low achievers

Interaction		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Post test	Board Game-Low achievers	8	2.9375	.14079	.04978
	Drilling-Low achievers	8	2.6625	.23867	.08438
Gain	Board Game-Low achievers	8	.5328	.08763	.03098
	Drilling-Low achievers	8	.3938	.08638	.03054

Based on table 5 it can be seen that board game of low achievers have higher score than drilling of low achievers. The average of board game 2.9375 > 2.6625 of drilling, then the gain value of board game 0.5328 > 0.3938 of drilling. It means that board game to low achievers is more

effective than drilling at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* Senior High School of Tegal. Hypothesis 3: there is no significant difference of using board game to the high and low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal.

**Table 6.** Tukey Test

interaction	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Drilling-Low achievers	8	.3938		
Board Game-Low achievers	8		.5328	
Drilling-High achievers	8			.7346
Board Game-High achievers	8			.7925
Sig.		1.000	1.000	.563

The data shown on table 7 found that there is a significant difference of using board game, which was implemented for high 0.7925 and low achievers 0.5328 in speaking use of English taught using board game as shown in the different column. It means the null hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Hypothesis 4: there is no significant difference of using drilling to the high and low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal.

The data shown on table 4.13 found that there is a significant difference of using drilling, which was implemented for high (0.7346) and low achievers (0.3938) of grammar taught by using

drilling as shown in the different column. It means the null hypothesis 4 is rejected.

Hypothesis 5: there is no significant interaction of teaching technique (board game and drilling) and types of students of achievement (high and low) to the students' speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal.

From data analysis, it was found that there is a significant interaction of teaching technique (board game and drilling) and result of students of achievement (high and low). It was shown F-value is 9.965 > F-table 2.14 with the significance level of 0.000 < 0.05. So it means that the null hypothesis 5 is rejected.

## CONCLUSSIONS

Based on the results of data analysis, it can be concluded as follows:

There is no significant difference between using board game and drilling to the high achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal. The t-value is 1.296 with the significance  $0.216 > 0.05$ . It means that both of high achievers in different group were effective.

There is a significant difference between using board game and drilling to the low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal. The t-value is 3.193 with the significance of  $0.007 < 0.05$ . It means that there is enhancement of the board game group.

There is a significant difference of using board game to the high and low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal. The data are implemented for high (0.7925) and low achievers (0.5328) of speaking in spoken use of English taught using board game as shown in the different column.

There is a significant difference of using drilling to the high and low achievers in speaking at the eleventh grade students of *Ihsaniyah* senior high school of Tegal. It is implemented for high (0.7346) and low achievers (0.3938) of speaking in spoken use of English taught using board game as shown in the different column.

There is a significant interaction of teaching strategy (board game and drilling) and types of students of achievement (high and low). It is shown as F-value is  $9.96 > F\text{-table } 2.14$  with the significance level of 0.05. In my conclusion, the ability of high and low achievers on speaking

improved. It means that the techniques worked well.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, S. 2007. *Prosedur Penelitian; Suatu Pendekatan Praktik* (6<sup>th</sup> Revised Ed.). Jakarta: P.T. Rineka Cipta.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco State University: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Cohen, Louis et.al. 2007. *Research Methods in Education*. 6<sup>th</sup>ed. New York: Routledge.
- Gay, L.R. 1992. *Educational Research*. Competencies for Analysis and Application New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd Edition. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- J.1998. *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Longman
- Hornby A. S 1990. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. London: Oxford University Pres.
- Johnson, Burke and Christensen, Larry. 2000. *Educational Research*. Quantitative and Qualitative Approach. USA: A Pearson Education Company.
- K, Friederike. 1984. *Keep Talking, communicative fluency activities for language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, David. 1991. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, Jack C, and Rodgers Theodore S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching, Second Edition*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Sugiyono. 2010. *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta
- Tuckman, B. W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research*. N.Y. Harcourt Brace Jovanouich.